

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in light of the amendments and comments contained herein. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-20 are pending, of which claims 1-3,
 5 5-9, 13, and 15-19 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,798,997 to Hayward et al. (hereinafter, "Hayward"), in view
 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,867 to Lee (hereinafter, "Lee") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising:

- 15 detecting when a new replaceable component is installed into a printing device;
- determining if the new replaceable component has a particular brand name; and
- 20 providing a link to a restricted Web site that is restricted to users of products having the particular brand name if the new replaceable component is determined to have the particular brand name.

25

Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest providing a link to a restricted Web site that is restricted to users of products having the particular brand name if the new replaceable component is determined to have the particular brand name, as recited in claim 1.

30

The Office cites Hayward as disclosing a link to a restricted Web site that is restricted to users of products having the particular brand name, as recited in claim 1. (*Office Action* p.2; Hayward col.7 lns.60-63). However, the

referenced section of Hayward does not describe providing such a link. Rather, Hayward is directed to providing access to an on-line order screen or Web page for ordering consumable supplies (*Hayward* col.1 lns.48-49, col.7 lns.60-63). Although the Web page for ordering consumable supplies may be associated
 5 with a particular product, the Web page is not described as being provided via a restricted Web site (*Hayward* col.3 lns.60-65 and col.6 lns.42-48). In fact, there is no discussion anywhere in Hayward of a Web site that is restricted to users of products associated with a particular brand name, as recited in claim 1.

Lee is directed to methods by which a replaceable component and a
 10 printer containing the component communicate. There is no discussion in Lee of any restricted Web site, and the Office has not cited Lee as disclosing such.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

15

Claims 2-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-6 may be allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 5 recites that providing a link to the restricted Web site further
 20 comprises "providing the link to the restricted Web site via a dedicated Web browser that can only be used to access the restricted Web site." Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest providing a dedicated Web browser that can only be used to access the restricted Web site, as recited in claim 5.

The Office cites Hayward as disclosing this limitation of claim 5 (*Office*
 25 *Action* p.3; Hayward col.6 lns.49-53). However, the cited section of Hayward does not describe providing a dedicated Web browser that can only be used to access the restricted Web site, as recited in claim 5. Instead, the cited section

of Hayward describes accessing a Web page (e.g., *www.manufacturer.com/product/xxx*) on the unrestricted Web site of a particular manufacturer. There is no discussion in Hayward, of a dedicated Web browser that can only be used to access a restricted Web site.

5 With regards to a Web browser, Hayward describes that a user may use his Web browser to access any site on the Internet based on a URL (*Hayward* col.3 lns.60-65 and col.6 lns.42-48). Therefore, if anything, Hayward teaches away from a dedicated Web browser that can only be used to access the restricted Web site, as recited in claim 5.

10 Lee does not describe a dedicated Web browser that can only be used to access a restricted Web site, as recited in claim 5, and the Office has not cited Lee as disclosing such.

Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that
15 the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7 recites a printing device, comprising:

20 a restricted Web browser configured to access a restricted Web site which is restricted to users of replaceable components having a particular brand name, and further configured to access the restricted Web site if the brand name of the replaceable component installed in the printing device is identified as being the particular brand name.

25

As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest a restricted Web site which is restricted to users of replaceable components having a particular brand name, as recited in claim 7. Further, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest a restricted Web
30 browser configured to access the restricted Web site if the brand name of the

replaceable component installed in the printing device is identified as being the particular brand, as recited in claim 7.

The Office cites Hayward as disclosing a restricted Web browser configured to access a restricted Web site, as recited in claim 7 (*Office Action* p.4; *Hayward* col.7 lns.60-67 and col.6 lns.38-60). However, the cited sections of Hayward do not describe a restricted Web browser configured to access a restricted Web site if the brand name of the replaceable component installed in the printing device is identified as being the particular brand, as recited in claim 7.

10 The cited sections of Hayward merely describe providing access to an on-line page for ordering consumable supplies (*Hayward* col.1 lns.48-49 and col.7 lns.60-63). There is no discussion in Hayward of a restricted Web browser. As mentioned previously, with regards to a Web browser, Hayward describes that a user can use his Web browser to access any site on the Internet
15 based on a URL (*Hayward* col.3 lns.60-65 and col.6 lns.42-48). Therefore, if anything, Hayward teaches away from the restricted Web browser recited in claim 7.

There is no discussion in Lee of a restricted Web browser configured to access the restricted Web site if the brand name of the replaceable component
20 installed in the printing device is identified as being the particular brand, and the Office has not cited Lee as disclosing such.

Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

25

Claims 8-12 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 7. Additionally, some or all of claims 8-12 may be allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 8 recites that "the restricted Web browser is a dedicated Web
5 browser that can only access the restricted Web site" and "further comprising a general Web browser that is configured to provide access to one or more unrestricted Web sites to users of products not having the particular brand name."

A described above in response to the rejection of claim 7, Hayward
10 and/or Lee do not teach or suggest a restricted Web browser, as recited in claim 8. Further Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest a printing device including both a restricted Web browser (*i.e.*, a dedicated Web browser that can only access the restricted Web site) and a general Web browser that is configured to provide access to one or more unrestricted Web sites to users of
15 products not having the particular brand name, as recited in claim 8. Neither Hayward and/or Lee teach or suggest a printing device which includes both a restricted Web browser and a general Web browser, as recited in claim 8.

Claim 13 recites a printing device replaceable component, comprising:

20

component memory that stores a brand identifier which is verified by a printing device in which the replaceable component is installed to determine whether the replaceable component has a particular brand name which the printing device associates with a
25 restricted Web site, the printing device providing access to a restricted Web browser configured to access the restricted Web site when the printing device determines that replaceable component has the particular brand name.

As described above in response to the rejection of claims 1 and 7, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest the restricted Web site and/or the restricted Web browser, as recited in claim 13.

The Office acknowledges that Hayward does not disclose a brand identifier which is verified by a printing device in which the replaceable component is installed before the printing device provides access to the restricted Web site, and relies on Lee for the deficiencies of Hayward (*Office Action* p.6; *Lee* col.3 lns.61-65). However, the cited section of Lee simply describes that a printer can include a sensor, for sensing if a replacement component is installed.

Lee does not describe that the brand identifier is verified by a printing device in which the replaceable component is installed to determine whether the replaceable component has a particular brand name which the printing device associates with a restricted Web site, as recited in claim 13. Further Lee does not describe that the printing device provides access to a restricted Web browser configured to access the restricted Web site only when the printing device determines that the replaceable component has the particular brand name, as recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14-15 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 13. Additionally, some or all of claims 14-15 may be allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for independent reasons.

Claim 16 recites one or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

5 identifying a brand name associated with a replaceable component in a printing device; and

10 providing access to a restricted Web site if the brand name associated with the replaceable component is a particular brand name which the printing device associates with the restricted Web site.

As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest providing access to a restricted Web site if
 15 the brand name associated with the replaceable component is a particular brand name which the printing device associates with the restricted Web site, as recited in claim 16. It follows that Hayward and/or Lee do not teach or suggest one or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the steps recited
 20 above.

Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

25 Claims 17-20 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 16. Additionally, some or all of claims 17-20 may be allowable over the Hayward-Lee combination for independent reasons.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is

5 urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 22, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

10